

Instrument Construct to Evaluate the Competence of English Lecturers at State Islamic Institute in Indonesia

by Sahraini Sahraini

Submission date: 19-Jun-2020 05:41PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1346489213

File name: instrument.pdf (339.72K)

Word count: 5188

Character count: 29846



Instrument Construct to Evaluate the Competence of English Lecturers at State Islamic Institute in Indonesia

Dr. Sahraini, M.Hum

State Islamic Institut (IAIN) Palopo, Indonesia

Bio-Profile:

Dr. Sahraini, M.Hum is interested in research, assessment, evaluation in Education. She graduated with honors from Doctoral Degree in State University of Yogyakarta. She also one of the founders of English study program in IAIN Palopo.

Abstract

Lecturers are professional educators in college and have a duty to plan, implement, and evaluate the learning process. In line with this, the research was conducted to construct an instrument for evaluating lecturers' competence. In developing instruments, the researcher used Research and Development study consisting of five steps, i.e.: (1) preliminary investigation, (2) development, validation, and final product. The subjects of this study were lecturers at the Faculty of Education and Teaching Training IAIN Palopo (State Islamic Institute). The aim of this study is to produce instruments for evaluating lecturers' competencies. The instrument have covered lecturers' competency in preparing lesson plan, conducting teaching and learning processes, and evaluating the result of teaching and learning processes. The instruments were validated by experts and practitioners. Afterward, the validity of the instruments were analyzed Exploratory Factor Analysis and the reliability coefficient of instrument were analyzed by Genova (Generalizability of Variants). The instrument produced were : (1) competence in opening a teaching-learning process evaluated in four items; (2) competence in presenting teaching-learning materials evaluated in thirteen items; (3) competence in using teaching-learning media evaluated in six items; (4) competence in asking and involving students in a teaching-learning process evaluated in thirteen items; (5) competence in maintaining positive personality in a teaching-learning process evaluated in eleven items, (6) competence in motivating students to use English evaluated in ten items; (7)

competence in managing teaching-learning time evaluated in four items; (8) competence in closing a teaching-learning process evaluated with five items.

Keywords: Instruments Construct, Evaluate, Lecturer Competence

Introduction

The lecturer is one of the academic community members who greatly contributes to the advancement of the university. A professional and competent lecturer is needed to perform roles, obligations, and responsibilities. A lecturer is a professional educator and scientist whose main tasks are transforming, developing and disseminating science, technology and arts through education, research, and community service (Government Regulation 2005, Government Regulation 2009). Furthermore, the main task of a lecturer is to implement the Three Pillars of higher education with a workload of a minimum of twelve credits and a maximum of sixteen credits in each semester by following academic qualifications. Meanwhile, the professor is a lecturer with the highest academic position in the higher education unit and has the special task of writing scientific books and works and disseminating his/her ideas to enlighten the society.

The evaluation of the lecturer's competence is aimed at improving lecturer practice to improve student learning, so every lecturer must have adequate knowledge, especially mastery of pedagogical content knowledge. To find out these competencies, it is necessary to conduct an in-depth study to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of lecturers in the process of learning English through valid and reliable instruments.

There are several government policies related to the lecturer evaluation system such as lecturer certification (2014) and assessment of Lecturer Workload (Dirjen Pendik, 2010) which is conducted every semester, but the instruments used are not standardized and have not used detailed instruments to identify the competence of English lecturers. In addition, the components assessed are general in nature and only cover knowledge. Therefore, this research attempts to construct an instrument that can be used as a standard instrument to evaluate the competence of English lecturers in Indonesia to measure the achievement of the works of lecturers. The purposes of instrument evaluation is to promote an enhancement of professional practice in order to upgrade instruction, which has been directly linked to students achievement (McCaffrey et.al,2003). So, the results of the evaluations are beneficial in understanding the areas of possible improvement for the lecturer (Yeoh Sok-Foon Yeoh Sok-Foon, Jessica Ho

Sze-Yin, & Benjamin Chan Yin-Fah, 2012). In addition, lecturer evaluation can be made as materials for lecturers to introspect about their strengths and weaknesses in the learning process.

Literature Review

Lecturer's Competence Indicators

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers states that Lecturers are professional educators and scientists whose main tasks are teaching, developing, and disseminating science, technology and arts through education, research and community service (Law No. 14 Year 2005 Article 1 Paragraph 2). This law the competence of lecturers can be developed in more detail as follows:

1. Competence in the field of study consists of sub-competencies of (a) understanding courses that have been prepared to teach, (b) understanding competences, curricula, and subject matter lectured in his/her respective college/university, (c) understanding the scientific structure, concepts and methods that deal with course materials, (d) understanding the relationship of concepts between related courses, (e) applying scientific concepts in daily life, (f) developing the field of study that he/she is undertaking.
2. Pedagogic competence consists of sub-competences of (a) contributing to curriculum development related to the courses taught, (b) developing syllabus based on developed competences, (c) planning lecture plans based on the syllabus that has been developed, (d) designing lecture management, class and laboratory management, (e) delivering lectures that are pro-change, (f) assessing student learning outcomes authentically, (g) guiding students in various aspects, (h) writing textbooks that are textually, actually, and factually synergic, (i) developing self-professionalism as a lecturer, and (j) developing e-learning as one of the learning methods to make students active. Related to this, Arellano-Tamayo, Ria (2018) in the Asian EFL Journal December 2018, issue 12.3 found that to be an active ESL classroom, the teacher uses a language within their level of understanding.
3. Professional ethics competence consists of sub-competences of (a) understanding, fully comprehending and implementing lecturer ethics, (b) providing education services wholeheartedly, professionally and with high expectations for students, (c) respecting differences in student background and making high commitment to improve their learning achievement, (d) demonstrating and promoting values, norms, positive attitudes and behaviors, (e) contributing to the development of departments/study programs in general and lectures in particular, (f) making themselves an integral part of their

college/university, (g) being responsible for their achievements, (h) performing their duties in the corridors of prevailing laws and regulations, (i) developing self-professionalism through self-evaluation, reflection, and updating various matters related to their duties, and (j) understanding, fully comprehending, and implementing foundations of education: juridical, philosophical, and scientific.

4. Social competence consists of sub-competences of (a) understanding and respecting differences and having the ability to manage conflict and difference, (b) implementing harmonious cooperation with fellow lecturers, superiors and other relevant parties, (c) building a compact, intelligent, dynamic, and agile teamwork, (d) performing effective and pleasant communication with various parties, (e) having the ability to understand and internalize environmental changes that affect their duties, (f) being able to put themselves in the value system prevailing in the surrounding community, (g) implementing the principles of good governance (participation, transparency, accountability, law enforcement, and professionalism).
5. Research competence consists of sub-competences of (a) understanding the philosophy of science in the field of study, (b) mastering theories of the field that he/she is undertaking, (c) understanding approaches to develop science that he/she is undertaking, (d) understanding paradigms and research approaches in the field of science , (e) understanding research methodology, (f) understanding research methods in the field of study, (g) understanding quantitative and qualitative data analysis tools, (h) publishing scientific research findings or scientific articles, (i) attending scientific seminars or meetings, (j) understanding actual and factual matters in the field of study, (k) always developing research methodologies, research methods, and data analysis techniques, (l) understanding problems encountered by science, State and society in the field of study, (m) using the latest ICT to support the development of knowledge, (n) always progressively developing knowledge, (o) diligently conducting research, (p) being open to criticism, input, and suggestions for improvements to the results of his/her works, and (q) developing research on his campus.
6. Community service competence consists of sub-competencies of (a) understanding actual problems and offering proper solutions to solve problems encountered by the community, (b) establishing partnerships synergistically with the community in order to promote and develop one another, (c) establishing cooperation with local governments in order to promote their regions, (d) disseminating their knowledge to the community to participate in educating the nation, (e) facilitating the central government and regional governments

in order to implement decentralization and regional autonomy in their fields of expertise, (f) advocating for the community concerning the importance of improving life and the efforts that need to be taken in accordance with their fields of expertise, (g) conducting community surveys whose results can be used as consideration in preparing community service programs, (h) conducting various university promotions, (i) conducting field training practices that is able to improve conditions/situations, (j) providing open services to the community through consultation with lecturers related to the problems encountered.

Other authors (Tzu-Chia Chan (2015) conducted a research on the dimensions of teacher self-assessment in Intercultural Communicative Competency (ICC) consisting of four dimensions of ICC, namely: (a) communication skills, (b) ability to use cross-cultural strategies in ELT, (c) perspective to ELT, and (d) affective orientation in communicating between cultures. Meanwhile, Wolfhagen, Scherpbier & Vleuten (2003) divide five dimensions in developing assessment instruments to evaluate the competence of English teachers or lecturers, namely active learning, self-directed learning, contextual learning, collaborative learning and interpersonal behavior.

To increase the competence of lecturers in performing their duties and responsibilities, Indonesian government has also implemented policies in the form of lecturer certification, both lecturers under the Ministry of National Education and under the Ministry of Religious Affairs. In the lecturer certification manual, it is stated that lecturer certification aims to assess the professionalism of lecturers, in order to improve the quality of education in the higher education system. Professionalism recognition is expressed in the form of giving education certificates to lecturers who have passed certification. Therefore, the certification of lecturers is intended to improve the quality, performance and professionalism of lecturers in performing their academic duties. Accordingly, a standardized assessment instrument is needed to find out whether the certified lecturer has actually carried out his duties and obligations.

Objectives of Lecturer Assessment

Lecturers play an important role in education, so that the success of education must be accompanied by adequate quality of lecturers. On the contrary, a qualified lecturer who is not supported by other supporters may not optimize their performance. Because lecturers are the spearhead in improving the quality and service of education in higher education, they are required to have adequate competence in achieving educational success.

In the Lecturer Workload textbook and evaluation of the implementation of the Three Pillar of Higher Education (2010), it is stated that lecturer evaluation aims to: (1) improve the

professionalism of lecturers, (2) improve educational processes and outcomes, (3) improve lecturer performance accountability, (4) improve the academic atmosphere at all levels of higher education, and (5) accelerating the realization of national education goals. It is further explained that the principle of determining Lecturer Workload and Evaluation of the Implementation of the Three Pillars of Higher Education is based on self-evaluation; mutual love, mutual improvement and mutual care; improving the professionalism of lecturers, improving the academic atmosphere; and promoting university independence.

Wilkerson & Lang (2007: 3) explain the importance of evaluating teachers or lecturers, which is to encourage lecturers to continuously reflect on the results of the learning process in order to improve the quality of learning in the classroom. The results of the Tzu-Chia Chao (2015) study show that the results of self-evaluation of English lecturers can be used to increase self-awareness in response to the development of English language learning. In addition, Isore (2009: 6) reveals two main objectives of teacher or lecturer evaluation, namely: first, to ensure that the lecturer shows his best performance to improve student learning; and second, looking for improvements in the teacher's own practice. Therefore, lecturers who reflect on their teaching will become a power to improve themselves for the advancement of their students (C.Ganga Lakshmi & R.Naganathan, 2019). Thus, the results of English language lecturer evaluations are needed (Young & Sachdev, 2011). From the various aforementioned opinions, it can be concluded that lecturer performance evaluation aims to: improve lecturer performance in teaching and learning activities in the classroom, improve the quality of learning and education services in accordance with the needs of all stakeholders, and ensure the best service to students.

Steps for Making Instrument Construct

The construct of the lecturer competence evaluation instrument is intended to obtain a standard instrument. The instrument is developed empirically through testing both through experts and field trials. Ebel and Prisdie (1991: 286) argue that a standard test is a test prepared by experts, always tested, analyzed and revised, including scoring techniques. From this standardization process, the instrument will be valid and reliable.

The success of an evaluation is determined by measuring instruments, methods, and human abilities using instruments. There are several theories proposed by experts related to the development of instruments, namely, the theory of Borich, Gronlund, and Lambert. Borich (1977: 57) states that four steps are taken in developing a valid assessment (instrument), namely: (1) identifying the underlying philosophy or meta theory as a guide to process

development, (2) selecting or compiling a basic theory based on that philosophy which describes the relationship between the behavior of teacher/lecturer and student, (3) planning a prototype model that combines selected theories to create a sequence of specific behavioral description, and (4) testing validation by trying and revising one or more rating systems.

Furthermore, Gronlund (1993: 115) argues that performance measurement includes methods, procedures, and data collection techniques. An instrument will be effective if it uses a systematic approach by: (1) specifying the results of the performance to be measured, (2) choosing the focus of the assessment, (3) choosing the level of realism, (4) choosing the performance situation, and (5) choosing method, investigating, recording, and scoring.

Meanwhile, Lambert Clark (1979: 23) proposes key elements in performance assessment, namely: (1) job analysis, (2) job description, (3) assessment area selection, (4) performance standard determination, (5) assessment performance review, (6) guidance and planning of actions, training, and (7) review of the performance assessment conducted. Based on the aforementioned studies, the steps taken in developing the instrument is to theoretically review the substance to be measured, namely determining the conceptual definition and the operational definition, translating operational definition into indicators and items, assembling instruments, conducting trials, and analyzing the results of trial items.

Methodology

This instrument development model used Research and Development by adopting a model design from Borg and Gall (1983: 771-787) with ten steps of development, namely: (1) preliminary study and data collection; (2) planning; (3) initial product development; (4) initial trial; (5) revisions to make main products; (6) main field trials; (7) revisions to make main product (8) operational product trials; (9) revisions of final product, and (10) dissemination and implementation of product development results. Furthermore, the researcher only modified the appropriate steps, namely (1) preliminary study/initial investigation stage, (2) development stage, (3) validation stage, (4) trial and revision stage, and (5) finalization of product.

In the Instrument Development Stage, the researcher conducted the following activities; (1) performing lecturer task analysis and lecturer competence, (2) identifying lecturer competences, (3) making lecturer competency recapitulation, (4) making lecturer competence standard draft and construct of instrument, (5) based on components and sub-components of lecturer competence, (6) making draft dimensions and indicators of lecturer competence, (7) conducting Validation and Reliability, and (8) formulating lecturer competences. Furthermore, at the Validation stage, validity of instrument products was tested

the through expert judgment and field trials. The subjects in this research were English lecturers of IAIN Palopo. Sampling was taken using purposive sampling with a sample size of 35 lecturers divided into three categories, namely lecturers with functional ranks of instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor.

The results of the instrument trial data were analyzed in two stages, namely small-scale (limited) trials and large-scale (expanded) trials. The purpose of the instrument trial was testing the validity and reliability of instrument. The validity of the instrument trial results was analyzed using Exploratory Factor Analysis, or EFA. The analysis using EFA resulted in data in the form of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO-MSA) index, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity test, and significance level. In addition, it also produced item correlation index, loading factor cumulative, number of components formed, and Alpha coefficients.

The validity of the instrument was calculated using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Hair, et al. (2006: 115) state that the criteria required in factor analysis are Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy index $\geq .5$, and Bartlett's of Sphericity test with a significance level $\leq .05$. Furthermore, they categorized if the KMO-MSA index is $\geq .8$ = meritorious, $.7$ -. 0.8 = middling, $.6$ -. 7 = mediocre, $.5$ -. 6 = miserable, and less than $.5$ = unacceptable. Furthermore, items (whether an item is acceptable or not) are selected based on the total item correlation index (which can be seen in the output table of the results of SPSS analysis in the corrected item-total correlation column). Items are said to be unacceptable if the total item correlation index value is less than $.3$ ($r_{it} < .3$). Afterwards, the product implementation was tested to the English language lecturers at IAIN Palopo.

Findings

Data Analysis of Validation and Readability Test Results

1. Data of Instrument validation results

The instrument validation was conducted in two ways, namely panel expert (expert judgment) and field trials. The expert panel was conducted through FGD. several feedbacks from experts included: (1) the evaluator's name should not be mentioned on the assessment instrument sheet in order to prevent discomfort from both evaluators and teachers, especially from students, (2) examples of how to fill the instrument should be provided to make it easier for evaluators to fill out the instrument, (3) the number of instrument items should be reduced to avoid the boredom of evaluators in filling out the instrument sheets, (4) there were some

writing errors, inappropriate words, and (5) the instrument should be supplemented by an explanation of each indicator to guide the evaluator in the assessment.

2. Data of the clarity test results for competency assessment in lecturers of IAIN Palopo by experts

Table 1

Clarity of Instruments for Assessing Competence of English Lecturers

No	Assessment Aspect	Assessment and Average score
1	Clarity of instrument instructions	4.2
Indicator coverage:		
2	Instrument for the ability of English lecturers to plan lectures	4.4
3	Instruments for the ability of English lecturers to conduct the lecture process	4
4	Instrument for the ability of English lecturers to assess lecture results	4
Total		16.6
Average		4.15

From the results of expert assessment analysis on the construct of the instrument if it is confirmed in the table of clarity assessment categories of lecturer competence assessment instruments, all belong to the very good category. This means that according to the validator's assessment, the instrument design was stated to be very good. Therefore, the lecturer evaluation instrument was feasible to use.

Furthermore, the results of the Aiken's V coefficient analysis by experts regarding the clarity of the lecturer competence assessment instruments are as follows:

Table 2

Aiken's V Coefficient for Clarity of Lecturer Competence Assessment Instrument

No	Assessment Aspect	Aiken's V Coefficient

1	Clarity of instrument instructions	.71
Clarity and completeness of indicator coverage:		
2	instrument for planning learning	.67
3	Instruments for implementing learning process	.75
4	Instrument for assessing learning outcomes	.75
Language:		
5	Formulation of instrument statement	.71
6	Use of standard language	.75

The results of the coefficient analysis of content validity using Aiken's V if consulted with the criteria for the content validity are: .8 – 1.000: very high .6 - .799: high .4 - .599: fairly high .2 - .399: low < .200: very low. Therefore, the clarity of the lecturer competence assessment instrument for the Faculty of Tarbiyah of IAIN Palopo shows high value of the Aiken's V coefficient. Accordingly, the assessment of experts and practitioners on the three aspects of the assessment above has good content validity. In other words, the item has fulfilled the contents of the concept or the suitability of the item.

A. Analysis of Trial Result Data

There were three main dimensions that were tested both on limited scale trials and on extended scale trials, namely (1) lecturer competences in lecture planning, (2) lecturer competences in the implementation of the lecture process, and (3) lecturer competences in assessing lecture results. The instrument trials involved 3 evaluators, namely evaluators from fellow lecturers, lecturers themselves, and students taught by the lecturers concerned. The aspects assessed are the preparation for the implementation of lecture of English lecturers, the implementation of lecture, and the evaluation of lecture.

1. Results of Instrument Trial on a limited scale

The results of the trial using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) analysis showed that the number of items experienced a reduction while the number of dimensions did not change. The changes in the number of items can be seen in the following table:

Table 3
Changes in the Number of Items on Each Indicator on
Dimensions of Preparation for Lectures

Indicator	Change		Number of Unacceptable Items
	Before the trial	After the trial	
1. Preparation of course syllabus	5	2	3
2. Selection of course material	4	2	2
3. Selection of lecture strategies/ methods			
4. Selection and design of lecture media			
5. Plan for assessment of course material	5	4	1
Total	14	8	6

The data above show that the number of valid items on the lecture preparation dimension is 6. Reduction occurs in all indicators of that dimension. Furthermore, the test results data on the dimensions of lecture implementation can be seen in the following table.

Table 4
Changes in the Number of Items on Each Indicator on
Dimensions of Lecture Implementation

Indicator	Change		
	Before the trial	After the trial	Number of Unacceptable Items
1. Ability of lecturer to deliver course material	17	15	2

2. Ability of lecturer to use lecture methods/ strategies	4	4	0
3. Ability of lecturer to use lecture media	3	3	0
4. The discipline of lecturer in teaching and filling in the minutes of lectures	14	9	5
Total	38	31	7

Table 4 shows that there are 2 indicators, namely ability of lecturer to use lecture methods/strategies and ability of lecturer to use lecture media, that do not change. Meanwhile, the most changes in the number of instrument items are the discipline of lecturer in teaching and filling in the minutes, namely 5 items, then the ability of the lecturer to deliver course material by 2 items. Therefore, the dimensions of lecture implementation consist of 41 valid items. Furthermore, the data of the limited trial results to the dimensions of the lecturer' ability to evaluate the results of lectures- are as follows.

Table 5
Changes in the Number of Items on Each Indicator on
Dimension of evaluation of lecture results

Indicator	Change		
	Before the trial	After the trial	Number of Unacceptable Items
The ability of lecturer to assess the results of evaluation of course material	12	10	2
Total	12	10	2

Table 5 shows that the dimension of the ability of the lecturer to evaluate the lecture results consisted of 10 items and only 2 items are unacceptable.

The analysis results of the limited trial using EFA indicate that the three dimensions consists of preparation of lecture containing 8 items, implementation or lecture process containing 31 items, and evaluation of the lecture results containing 10 items. Thus, the total number of the three dimensions is 49 items. Furthermore, the results of KMO-MSA (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy) index, the *Bartlett's Test of Sphericity*, and the significance level for each dimension and indicator are as follows.

1. Dimension of Lecture Preparation

The results of the trial using EFA analysis indicate the KMO index value of .60 (mediocre) and the *Bartlett's Test of Sphericity* with a significance level of $\leq .05$, i.e. .030. In addition, all items have a loading factor above .5, where the lowest factor is .720 and the highest is .830. The total item correlation index on this indicator shows that all items have a total item correlation index of above 0.3. Furthermore, the results of the reliability analysis show an Alpha coefficient of .74 with a loading factor cumulative of 76.5%. This means that the five indicators can be used to measure the dimension of lecture preparation.

2. Dimension of lecture implementation

The Table of Component Matrix^a in the results of EFA analysis shows the KMO index of .82 (middling). The results of *Bartlett's Test of Sphericity* test with a significance level of $\leq .05$ is, .000. All items have a factor loading above .5, where the lowest factor is .400 and the highest is .70. All indicators have a total item correlation index of above .3. The results of the reliability analysis also show the Alpha coefficient value of .802 with a factor cumulative loading of 46.30%. Based on the results of the EFA analysis, it can be stated that all items are considered valid to measure the dimension of lecture implementation.

3. Dimensions of evaluation of lecture results

The results of the EFA analysis indicate that the factor formed in this indicator is one component, with the KMO index value of .82 (meritorious). The results of *Bartlett's Test of Sphericity* with a significance level of $\leq .05$ is, .000. All items have a factor loading above .5, with the lowest factor of .663 and the highest of .806. Similarly, the total item correlation index is above .3 and the Alpha coefficient value is .702, and the load factor cumulative is 61.50%. Thus, all items

can be used to measure the ability of lecturers in the dimension of lecture evaluation and considered acceptable.

The following are the results of the recapitulation of the three components of the instrument to evaluate the competence of English lecturers.

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.793
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	102.963
	df	3
	Sig.	.000

Total Variance Explained

Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
2.508	84.524	84.524	2.508	84.524	84.524
.362	12.065	95.670			
.130	4.330	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1		
A1	.918	Reliability Statistics	
A2	.949	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
A3	.863	.881	3

Extraction Method:
Principal Component
Analysis.
a. 1 components
extracted.

The results of the recapitulation of the three components of the lecturer assessment are the KMO index value of .893 (good) and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity test with a significance level of $\leq .05$, namely .000. In addition, all items have a loading factor above .5, where the lowest factor is .863 and the highest is .949. The total item correlation index on this indicator also shows that all items have a total item correlation index above .3. Furthermore, the results of the reliability analysis showed an Alpha coefficient of .881 with a *cumulative loading factor* of 84.524%. Thus, all components can be used to measure the ability of English lecturers.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the development and study of the final product, this research concludes that the lecturer competence assessment instrument consists of three components, namely ability of lecturer to plan lectures, ability of lecturer to implement the lecture process, and ability of lecturer to evaluate the lecture results. The dimension of lecture preparation consists of 4 indicators with 10 questionnaire items, the dimension of lecture implementation consist of 5 indicators with 27 questionnaire items, and the dimension of evaluation of the lecture results consists of 1 indicator with 10 questionnaire items. The instrument developed has met the requirements, that all indicators grouped on one factor (unidimensional) and the total item correlation index is below 0.3. Therefore, the instrument produced in this research have been deemed valid and reliable, so that they can be used by evaluators to measure the ability of English lecturers.

The findings contribute to encourage lecturers competence, because the impact of lecturer competence assessment instrument can have a positive influence on improving the quality of lecturers in teaching and learning. Moreover, it can identify the weaknesses and strengths to plan, to conduct, to assess lecture result.

Thus, it is suggested that instruments can be used as a reflection of lecturers to improve the quality of education for students. In addition, it can be used as material for consideration for higher education leaders to be used as lecturer competence assessment standards in Islamic

higher education institutions and in other higher education because this instrument has been scientifically examined and declared valid and reliable

References

- Arellano-Tamayo, Ria. (2018). Spoken Discourse Analysis on Language Use Along Turn Taking and Topic Management in English as Second Language (ESL) Classrooms. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(12.3), 8-24
- Borg, W.R. and Gall, M.D. (1983). *Educational research: An Introduction* (4th). Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall. Inc.
- C. Gangalakshmi and R. Naganathan (2019). Reflective teaching-A Source for reconstituting teaching pedagogy. *Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2), 399-120
- D.H.J.M.Dolmans, H.A.P.Wolfhagen, A.J.J.A.Scherpbier & C.P.M.Van Der Vleuten (2003) Development of an instrument to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher in guiding small group. *Higher Education: Klawer Academic Publisher*, (46): 431-446.
- Dirjen Dikti, 2010, Pedoman Beban Kerja Dosen dan Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Tridharma Perguruan Tinggi, Jakarta
- Ebel, R.L & Ebel, A.,D (1991). *Essentials of education measurement*. New Jersey: Printise Hall Englewood Cliffs.
- Gronlund, N.E. & Robert L.L. (1990). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Hair, J. F., et al. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Isore, M. (2009). *Teacher evaluatiron currunt practices in OECD countries and a literature review*. Paris *OECD*. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers.
- McCaffrey, J.Lockwood,D.&Koretz.D, & Hamilton.I. (2003). *Evaluating value added models for teacher accountability*. Santa Monica,C.A.RAND Corporation. Retrieved from www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG158.html.
- Tzu-Chia Chan (2015). Constructing a self-assessment inventory of intercultural communicative competences in ELT for EFL teachers. *Asian EFL Journal*. 17 (4)94-120.

Undang-Undang RI Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 Tentang Guru dan Dosen, Yogyakarta: Tim Cemerlang Publisher, 2007.

Wilkerson, J.R. & Lang, W.S. (2007). *Assessing teacher competency*. California: Corwin Press.

Willkerson, J.R. & Lang, W.S. (2007). *Assessing teacher competency: five standards-based steps to valid measurement using the CAATS model*. United States: Corwin Press.

Yeoh Sok-Foon, Yeoh Sok-Foon, Jessica Ho Sze-Yin, Benjamin Chan Yin-Fah (2012) Student evaluation of lecturer performance among private university students: *Canadian Social Science*. 8(4), 238-243

Young, T.J. and Sachdev, I. (2011). Intercultural communicative competence: Exploring English Language Teacher's beliefs and practices. *Language Awareness*, 20(2), 81-98.

Instrument Construct to Evaluate the Competence of English Lecturers at State Islamic Institute in Indonesia

ORIGINALITY REPORT

20%

SIMILARITY INDEX

14%

INTERNET SOURCES

10%

PUBLICATIONS

16%

STUDENT PAPERS

MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

5%

★ Submitted to Iain Palopo

Student Paper

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography Off

Exclude matches Off